UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: MCKINSEY & COMPANY, INC., NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE CONSULTANT LITIGATION

MDL No. 2996

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO -33)

On June 7, 2021, the Panel transferred 17 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 543 F.Supp.3d 1377 (J.P.M.L. 2021). Since that time, 114 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Northern District of California. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of California and assigned to Judge Breyer.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of California for the reasons stated in the order of June 7, 2021, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

Nov 09, 2022

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FOR THE PANEL:

John W. Nichols Clerk of the Panel

I hereby certify that the annexed instrument is a true and correct copy of the original on file in my office.

ATTEST:
MARK B. BUSBY
Clerk, U.S. District Court
Northern District of California

by: Elizabeth C Sparcia

Deputy Clerk 11/09/2022

IN RE: MCKINSEY & COMPANY, INC., NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE CONSULTANT LITIGATION

MDL No. 2996

SCHEDULE CTO-33 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

| DIST | DIV. | <u>C.A.NO.</u> | CASE CAPTION |
|---------------------|------|----------------|---|
| | | | |
| CALIFORNIA EASTERN | | | |
| CAE | 1 | 22-01340 | County of Inyo et al v. McKinsey and Company, INC. |
| CAE | 1 | 22-01370 | County of Calaveras, et al. v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAE | 1 | 22-01379 | County of Madera, et al v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAE | 2 | 22-01876 | County of El Dorado et al v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAE | 2 | 22-01905 | County of Trinity et al., v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAE | 2 | 22-01912 | County of Butte et al v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAE | 2 | 22-01917 | County of Amador et al v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |
| | | | |
| CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN | | | |
| CAS | 3 | 22-01624 | County of San Diego et al v. Mckinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAS | 3 | 22-01660 | County of Imperial et al v. Mckinsey and Company, Inc. |
| CAS | 3 | 22-01661 | City of Chula Vista et al v. Mckinsey and Company, Inc. |
| | _ | | , ,, |
| OREGON | | | |
| 0.7 | _ | | |
| OR | 3 | 22-01648 | City of Portland, Oregon v. McKinsey and Company, Inc. |